

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

5

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102**

10 Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0069803 to Pollitt (hereinafter "Pollitt"). Applicant respectfully submits that Pollitt fails to teach or suggest the present invention as claimed.

15 Independent Claim 1 recites a method for detecting whether a received information content is identical to a plurality of stored information contents, comprising, *inter alia*, the steps of:

"comparing the parameter representing the received information content with the plurality of stored parameters; and

20 indicating that the received information content is identical to a stored information content if the corresponding parameters are equal."

Independent Claim 6 recites a method for comparing a plurality of information contents comprising, *inter alia*, the step of "comparing the plurality of parameters, such that equality between a pair of the plurality of parameters indicates that  
25 corresponding pair of the plurality of information contents is identical."

Independent Claim 11 recites a computer readable medium embodying a method for comparing a plurality of information contents comprising, *inter alia*, the step of  
30 "comparing the plurality of parameters, such that equality between a pair of the plurality of parameters indicates that corresponding pair of the plurality of information contents is identical."

Independent Claim 12 recites a system for comparing a plurality of information contents comprising, *inter alia*, "means for comparing the plurality of parameters, such that an equality between a pair of the plurality of parameters indicates that a  
5 corresponding pair of the plurality of information contents are identical."

The Office Action states that Pollitt teaches each and every limitation of Claims 1-14. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

10 Pollitt discloses a method of obtaining content from a remote store using an end station, the end station and the store being coupled to a processing system, the store storing a number of content instances and content details, the content details providing predetermined information relating to each content instance. See Abstract. Pollitt fails to teach or suggest "comparing the parameter representing the received  
15 information content with the plurality of stored parameters; and indicating that the received information content is identical to a stored information content if the corresponding parameters are equal," as claimed in independent Claim 1. Pollitt also fails to teach or suggest "comparing the plurality of parameters, such that equality between a pair of the plurality of parameters indicates that corresponding  
20 pair of the plurality of information contents is identical," as claimed in independent Claims 6, 11, and 12. At most, in the paragraphs cited in the Office Action, Pollitt teaches a search procedure in which a request for content is received and data in the request (parameter values) is compared with stored content data to select and retrieve the content associated with the parameter values submitted in the request.  
25 In contrast, independent Claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 recite a comparison between parameters representing information contents, i.e. the received information content and the stored information contents, in order to determine if the corresponding information contents are identical.

30 Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 are distinguishable over Pollitt and should be allowed. Claims 2-5, 7-10, and 13-14, dependent directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1, 6, 11, and 12,

respectively, are also distinguishable over Pollitt and should also be allowed at least for the same reasons as stated above.


As a result, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and  
5 allowance of the Claims.

### CONCLUSION

10 Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the claimed invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States Patent.

15

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Florin Corie  
Reg. No. 46,244

20 Customer No. 22862